



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/512,140	10/22/2004	Richard Hugh Clark	TS7607 US	1942
Yukiko Iwata 7590 11/16/2009				
Shell Oil Company				
Intellectual Property				
P O Box 2463				
Houston, TX 77252-2463				
EXAMINER				
MCAVOY, ELLEN M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1797				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/16/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/512,140

Applicant(s)

CLARK ET AL.

Examiner

Ellen M. McAvoy

Art Unit

1797

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 September 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 43-85 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 43-85 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/ISD)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/10/2009

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 43-45, 48-51, 54-60, 63-72, 76-80, 84 and 85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berlowitz et al (6,663,767).

Applicants' arguments filed 16 September 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. As previously set forth, Berlowitz et al ["Berlowitz"] disclose a diesel fuel blended fuel composition which comprises an undercut conventional diesel fuel and a Fischer-Tropsch derived diesel fuel in amounts ranging from 5 to 90 vol. % of Fischer-Tropsch derived distillate, and 90 to 5 vol. % petroleum distillate. See the claims. Berlowitz teaches that the blended fuel demonstrates better than expected emissions and reduced sulfur content when used in a diesel engine. See column 2, lines 17-63. The Fischer-Tropsch derived diesel fuel is set forth in columns 3-4 wherein the Fischer-Tropsch derived hydrocarbon distillate has a T95 of at least 600°F, more preferably the Fischer-Tropsch derived distillate has an initial boiling point of at least 300°F and a T95 of at least 650°F, even more preferably an initial boiling point of at least 320°F and a T95 of at least 700°F to 750° F. See lines 49-54 in column 4. The examiner is of the position that the Fischer-Tropsch derived hydrocarbon distillate of Berlowitz meets the limitations of the Fischer-Tropsch derived gas oil of the claims. The blended fuel composition was subjected to engine testing wherein the blended diesel fuel was compared to conventional petroleum diesel fuels. Berlowitz teaches that significantly lower emissions and particulate

matter were produced from the diesel fuel blend when compared to two different conventional diesel fuels. See column 6, line 59 to column 7, line 40.

In response applicants presented new claims 43-85 which are essentially drawn towards a method of removing and/or reducing injector fouling and/or combustion related deposits in a diesel engine which comprises the step of combusting in the diesel engine a fuel blend comprising a sufficient amount of Fischer-Tropsch derived gas oil to produce a cleaned diesel engine. Applicants argued that Berlowitz does not disclose such a method of removing and/or reducing injector fouling and/or combustion related deposits in a diesel engine. This is not deemed to be persuasive because the method of the independent claims essentially comprises the step of combusting in the diesel engine a fuel blend comprising an amount of Fischer-Tropsch derived gas oil which is clearly taught by Berlowitz as set forth above. Although reducing injector fouling and/or engine deposits is not specifically set forth in Berlowitz, reduction of particulate matter is briefly discussed in column 7, lines 37-40, and it has been held that the discovery of a previously unappreciated property of a prior art composition, or of a scientific explanation for the prior art's functioning, does not render the old composition patentably new to the discoverer. See *Atlas Powder Co. v. Ireco Inc.*, 190 F.3d 1342,1347, 51 USPQ2d 1943, 1947 (Fed. Cir. 1999). Further the claiming of a new use, new function or unknown property which is inherently present in the prior art does not necessarily make the claim patentable. *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 1254, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977). Thus the examiner maintains the position that Berlowitz meets the limitations of the above rejected claims.

In response applicants argued that the claims are method claims and the court cases relied on by the examiner are inapplicable because they pertain to composition/product claims. This is

not deemed to be persuasive because the method of the independent claims essentially comprises the step of combustng in the diesel engine a fuel blend comprising an amount (unspecified) of Fischer-Tropsch derived gas oil which is clearly taught by Berlowitz as set forth above. The Fischer-Tropsch derived blended fuels of Berlowitz are being used for their known purpose as diesel fuels in compression-ignited (diesel) internal combustion engines. Berlowitz discloses that the blended diesel fuel demonstrates “better than predicted emission characteristics”. Berlowitz discloses that emissions include “solid particulate matter (PM) and nitrogen oxides (NOx)”. According to applicant, the reduction of injector fouling and/or engine deposits of the claims is not disclosed in Berlowitz and the examiner has not established that removing injector fouling is an **established function** of the claimed fuel blend.

The examiner responds by asserting that the combination of familiar elements according to known methods is likely to be obvious when it does nothing more than yield predictable results. *KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398, 416 (2007). In resolving obviousness issues, the question is whether the improvement is more than a predictable use of prior art elements according to their established functions. *KSR*, 550 U.S. at 417. If a person of ordinary skill can implement a predictable variation, § 103 likely bars its patentability.

In another words, if a claim extends to what is obvious, it is not patentable under §103. *KSR*, 550 U.S. at 419. See also *In re Munchmore*, 58 CCPA 719, 722, 433 F.2d 824, 826 (CCPA 1970). For this reason, the USPTO long ago adopted a practice, confirmed by binding court precedent, that any showing of unexpected results based on supposedly unpredictability, must be commensurate in scope with the breath of the claims. See *In re Grasselli*, 713 F.2d 731, 743 (Fed. Cir. 1983). The examiner is of the position that there is no evidence of record that the

reduction of injector fouling and/or engine deposits in diesel engines is an unexpected result based on supposedly unpredictability of the blended diesel fuel composition disclosed in Berlowitz.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 46, 47, 52, 53, 61, 62, 73-75 and 81-83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berlowitz et al (6,663,767) in combination with Bacha et al (6,776,897).

Applicants' arguments filed 19 September 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. As previously set forth, Berlowitz et al ["Berlowitz"] is relied on as outlined above. Applicants' invention may differ in several of the dependent claims by adding a conventional additive, namely a detergent, to the diesel fuel blend which is not taught in Berlowitz. However, Bacha et al ["Bacha"] is added to teach that diesel fuel compositions containing Fischer-Tropsch derived diesel fuels may comprise conventional additives such as detergents. See column 5, line 48 to column 6, line 66. Having the prior art references before the inventors at the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to the skilled artisan to have added a detergent to the diesel fuel blended composition of Berlowitz if its known imparted property was so desired.

Applicants' arguments are not deemed to be persuasive for the reasons set forth hereinabove.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicants are reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ellen M. McAvoy whose telephone number is (571) 272-1451. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:30-5:00) with alt. Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Caldarola can be reached on (571) 272-1444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

Art Unit: 1797

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ellen M McAvoy/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1797

EMcAvoy
November 10, 2009